DISTINCTIVE FEATURE OF TERMINOLOGICAL NOMINATION

Olga Ariskina
N.P. Ogarev Mordovian State University

Abstract

The purpose of the paper is to describe the essence of orientation as an attribute of the terminological sign. The novelty of the research is determined by the fact that the nature of terminological orientation has been scarcely studied so far. The effectiveness of taking into account the specifics of orientation characteristics of the term both in analyzing the existing units of languages for specific purposes and in creating new scientific words makes the present work timely and necessary.
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Introduction

Terms can be analyzed in various aspects: etymological, word-formational, functional, etc. One more is proposed in the paper: orientational aspect, for in our opinion, orientation is a most important attribute of the terminological sign and terminological systems. Issues of functioning of the term "orientation" in scientific research, of differentiation between the concepts "orientation", "inner form" and "motivation" are raised, and the essence of terminological orientation is considered.

History of the use of the concept "orientation" in linguistic research works

The concept of terminological orientation first appeared in the works of the founder of the Russian (Soviet) terminology science, D.S. Lotte. He used the adjective “orientiruyushchiy” (orienting) (Lotte, 1961: 41 - 42).

M.G. Berger (1965: 65) expressed this concept by the noun term “orientirovka” (orientation). The verb term “orientirovat” (to orient) is used by the Ukrainian linguist T.R.Kyyak ("At the same time the inner form does not claim and cannot claim to disclose the complete meaning of a language formation. Its main function is to provide clear orientation to the denotation, "to prompt" the main features of its meaning, i.e., to be one of the leading attributes emphasized in the meaning "(Kyyak, 1988: 28)) and the Russian terminologist E.I.Golovanova ("The form of the term, reflecting the complexity of the concept behind it, is not inert, it helps orient the specialist to certain properties of the object of thought" (Golovanov, 2009: 52)).


The names “correctly orienting”, “falsely motivated” and “falsely orienting” are found in the works of the Polish terminologist S.V.Grinyov- Grinevitch (2008: 64).
L.V. Rychkova proposes that the specifics of the expressive means of science be considered in a socially oriented aspect (2010: 65).

To date, research of orientation as a specific characteristic of the term is most fully presented in our papers (Ariskina, 2011, 2012) and in the works by Rebrushkina I.A. (2008). The material for the research by I.A.Rebrushkina were current linguistic terms of the Russian and Mordovian languages.

Understanding of orientation is often reduced to motivation and inner form. Certainly, these concepts are associated, but they are not identical. Further on we will try to differentiate between these concepts.

**Orientation and the inner form of the word**

Many researchers believe that the main function of the inner form is to provide clear orientation to denotation (Kiyak, 1988: 28); to represent the scientific concept in its entirety (Blinova, 1981: 33).

However, the term "inner form" is so complex that despite the long-term functioning (from the days of Wilhelm von Humboldt), it has not received a stable significative component. There are many definitions of this term. The wide range of meanings, the multi-concept character of the nomination "inner form" is accounted for by its being associated with either etymology (Potebnya, 1989: 175), or synchrony (Varina, 1976: 242]), or motivation as nomination (Budagov, 1965: 73), or motivation as derivativeness (Nemchenko, 1994: 228), or morphosemantic structure (Blinova, 1981: 32), or a sound shell (Rosental, 1976: 58), or the interiorized image (in our understanding, the receptor) (Kiyak, 1988: 29), or conception (Kolesov, 2012: 39) or the "image core" (Demyanov, 1997). The concept is certainly vague, but the exponent rouses many censures too.

To date, the problem of historical and contemporary interpretation of the concept, "the inner form of the word", is set out most completely in the work by V.V.Bibikhin who, summing up all the studied points of view on this issue, writes: “Confused; not understanding what the inner form is; building countless concepts; indulging in hopeless search for" primary elements of language "; in fact, plying in all areas of reality, naively following the pointer of the word; suffering from this hopeless bustle, modern linguistics will never be able to abandon the concept of inner form. This concept was given to it to its torments, because linguistics does not know where the concept comes from, it cannot see anything there, in the metaphysical tradition. For this, it would be necessary to dismantle the foundation of this tradition by way of “destruction” or “deconstruction.” Linguistics does not have the power to do so.” (Bibihin, 2008: 418-419). It only remains to agree with the scientist: "the inner form" is more a philosophical concept, than a linguistic one.

In terminology science it is more expedient to use the previously mentioned name "orientation" as a possibility to understand significatum by the exponent. However, in the process of research we constantly have to deal with the concept of "inner form", therefore we must explain what, in our opinion, should be understood by it.

Following A.A.Potebnya, we think that it is possible to include in this concept the nearest etymological meaning, although the nearest etymological meaning is nothing else but a producing one; therefore, combining etymology with word formation, we will call this ‘the origin of nomination’. Knowledge of the origin of nomination is one of the constituents of orientation.

**Orientation and motivation**
In addressing the issue of orientation and motivation relation, we are facing some difficulties. The situation is made more complicated by the existence of different approaches to understanding motivation. Thus, in the first approach, motivation is equated with word-formational derivation (Kubryakova, 1990: 467), (Nemchenko, 1994: 202), in the second approach, with the inner form (Telia, 1990) (Blinov, 1981) (Lemov, 2000) That is, in the science of language there exist narrow (word-formational) and broad (lexicological) approaches to motivation (see also the review in the paper: Perfiliyeva, 2010: 6 - 10).

Let us specify right away: we support the word-formational (narrow) approach to understanding motivation; however, so that the proponents of the broad approach may not reproach us with just substitution of terms, we need to point to the distinguishing features of orientation and of lexical and word-formative motivation.

The broad understanding of motivation is not very convincing for the analysis of the connection of the exponent and the significatum of the term. As a proof of this point of view it is sufficient to refer to one of the definitions of motivation according to which it is understood as the sum of the meanings of the unit constituents (Gak, 1990: 466). This interpretation contains the methodological hazard that makes us abandon the use of the concept of motivation for the analysis of terminology in this aspect. It is clear that the divided term is motivated (according to the broad approach). However, traditionally, in linguistics, motivated is a synonym for semantically clear, comprehensible, from which we come to the conclusion that divided is semantically clear, comprehensible too. But this conclusion turns out to be false, since the sum of the constituent parts of the unit is only the literal meaning, that does not always coincide with the actual, real terminological meaning and, consequently, does not always ensure semantic clarity.

Let us differentiate between similar, at first glance, concepts of motivation and orientation of the term, considering their common and distinguishing features.

I. Common features:
1. All terms are initially motivated (“... in language there are no absolutely unmotivated words” (Kyyak, 1988: 74)).

All terms at the moment of their emergence are orienting, since from the beginning of the formation of scientific knowledge every scientist tried to create or choose a rational nomination of a new concept; at the same time, the addressee may not notice the orientation capabilities of the term or may perceive them not as the author intended, due to objective and subjective reasons, among them the change of the term content connected with the development of scientific knowledge (objective reason), differences in the levels of education and language proficiency of the author and the addressee, their modes of thinking, age differences, belonging to different cultural and historical environments (subjective reasons), etc.

2. Motivation and orientation are characteristic both of native terms and of borrowed units, calques and hybrids.

It is obvious that the semantic clarity, "transparency" or, on the contrary, semantic "opacity" of the term - characteristics conditioned by motivational (in a broad sense) and orientational qualities – are determined not by the native or borrowed origin of the term or term element, but by the degree to which the unit has been acquired by the language, its regularity and frequency in this language. For example, the term elements poly-and mono- are clear to the Russian language speakers because it is possible to compare the meanings of the words “poligamiya” (polygamy), “polyglot”, “poly-vitamin”, "monografiya” (monograph), “monorels” (monorial), "monolog", etc.; therefore, the terms polysemiya (polisemy), monosemiya (monosemy) possess both motivation (in a broad sense), and orienting qualities: the term exponents point to the specified concepts of having one and many meanings.
3. In the process of the historical development of language and society words can be de-etymologized and re-etymologized in the motivational aspect. In the process of the development of language and the consciousness of its speakers the orienting qualities of terms may undergo changes - quantitative (from fully orienting capabilities to those neutralizing the orienting capabilities of the terminological unit) and qualitative (from a correct orientation to a false one). For example, the term *okonchaniye* (*ending*) at the moment of its emergence was a correctly orienting one, because in the first grammars, *okonchaniye* (*ending*) was the name for a word final; with the development of linguistic knowledge the term *okonchaniye* (*ending*) was correlated with the concept of an inflexional affix, an inflexion, and the term became falsely orienting, since, as is evident, not all finals are inflexions and not all inflexions are finals.

II Differentiating features of motivation and orientation of the term:

1. The difference between motivational, word-formational and orientational analyses.

The process of motivational analysis under the broad approach to the concept of "motivation" is aimed at the study of a motivational paradigm, and singling out of a motiveme, and lexical and structural motivators (Kozlova, 1999).

When making a word-formational analysis it is necessary to find out the following: meaning, motivating word, word-formative means, word-formative type, word-formative model, sometimes morphemic dividedness, and the productiveness-unproductiveness and regularity-irregularity of affixes.

In orientational research the motivational and word-formational analyses are used only as separate techniques (or they may not be used at all). The orientational analysis is broader as to the range of linguistic means; it includes the following techniques:

1) correlation of the term with a commonly used unit. For example: *kal’ka* (*calque*) is a linguistic term which orients us by the word meaning in the commonly used language: *kal’ka*

1. Transparent paper or cloth for making copies of blueprints and drawings. 2. A copy of a blueprint or drawing on such paper (Ozhegov, Shvedova, 1996: 256). Thus, we can conclude that in the framework of linguistics *kal’ka* (*calque*) is a "language copy";

2) analysis of system term elements: the native speaker, not knowing the meaning of the term *interfix*, but knowing that *suffix, prefix, affix* are word-formative units, is oriented by the international element *fix* in the term *interfix*, and is driven to the conclusion that this terminological unit is related to word-formation and is associated with the derivational structure of the word;

3) analysis of the word-formational structure: not knowing the differences in the semantics of the terms *palatalny – palatalizovanny* (*palatal – palatalized*), one can understand the difference in their meanings by comparing them with the units built according to the same derivational type, such as *sakharny - saharizovanny* (*sugary-sugarized*), where the semantic differences are more obvious;

4) translation of the term or its root morpheme into a foreign language: knowing that *lingva (lingua)* in Greek is "language", one can conclude: *lingvistik* (*linguistics*) is the science of language;

5) finding out the meaning of a complex foreign term by comparing it with other sciences’ terms that have a similar constituent part (international, as a rule): not knowing the meaning of the linguistic term *giperbola* (*hyperbole*), one can make a conclusion about its content, for example from the meanings of well-known medical terms that include the part *giper-* (*hyper-*): *gipervitaminoz* (*hypervitaminosis*), *gipertoniya* (*hypertension*), *giperemiyia* (*hyperemia*). The native speaker, a medical worker, who knows that in these words *giper* denotes exceeding the permissible level, comes to the conclusion, due to the analogy law: *giperbola* (*hyperbole*) is an excess, an exaggeration.
The proposed list of techniques is not final, it can be updated and extended (for detail see: Rebrushkina, 2005).

2. Motivation in a broad and narrow sense is studied within linguistics, whereas orientation should be investigated not only by linguistics, but also by the adjacent sciences - psycholinguistics, sociolinguistics, cultural linguistics, logic, etc.

3. In terms of motivation, one speaks not only about terms, but about words in general. In terms of orientation one can only speak about terminological units.

Lexical units of the commonly used language emerge and develop spontaneously, independent of the will of this or that individual; not all the words in the language are motivated; motivation is not always rational. As to creation of terms, it is always a conscious process.

4. The difference between motivation in lexicological understanding and orientation of the term is that motivation is based on a simple sum of the meanings of the parts constituting a language unit, whereas orientation is grounded on such sum of meanings that must point to the concept.

**The essence of terminological orientation**

From the above-mentioned propositions the following definition of terminological orientation can be given. Orientation is a phenomenon conditioned by linguistic, mental and social factors that enables a native speaker to determine without resorting to the definition, by the exponent the concept assigned to the term or the place of the given unit in the term system.

Let us try and look into the essence of this phenomenon.

Orientation is the result of the creative work of making terms. Creation of terms is an intelligent process, because the author (creator) of the term, a definite linguistic personality, consciously, deliberately and carefully assigns to the unit of scientific language an adequate, in his opinion, exponent. By the adequacy of the expression plane we mean nothing else but its orienting character that would correctly and logically (adequately) direct a native speaker to the nature of the concept or phenomenon assigned to the term.

Creation of terms is a subjective process. The author, a creator of the term, is a subject, a personality, a linguistic personality, endowed with certain scientific and general linguistic knowledge, mental qualities, "linguistic taste", dependent on the socio-historical structure and culture. All this affects terminological orientation, a quality representing the author's desire to reflect in the terminological nomination reference to the concept or to its important (in the opinion of the creator of the term) component. However, the term with such initial subjective orientation operates in the system of this or that science objectively. "The main principle, which underlies nomination, is through a particular feature of the nominated object to express its generalized image, i.e., to move from the subjective to the general, the objectified" (Volodina, 1993: 9).

At the same time the other native speaker (the addressee), ideally, must "read" the author’s message inherent in the term, using orientation capabilities of a scientific sign. Thus, when we try to determine the moment at which orientation qualities of the term were formed and analyze the process of translating these qualities to the addressee, we inevitably deal with two approaches to the study of linguistic units: onomasiological and semasiological (Danilenko, 1988: 108).

However, with such an ideal situation - the ideal "reading" and perception of the term - it is strange to ascertain that there exist falsely orienting and non-orienting terms in science. The problem is that in practice the addressee, the other linguistic personality, cannot always "read" correctly, or "read" at all the information inherent in the exponent. S/he may overlook orientation capabilities of the term or perceive them not as the author intended, due to
subjective reasons, including differences in the levels of education and language proficiency of the author and the addressee, their modes of thinking, age differences, belonging to different cultural and historical environments, etc. That is, "... conventional knowledge, as running ahead and indirect, is included in scientific cognition" (Komarova, 2010: 39).

In addition, there are objective reasons that hinder complete implementation of the author's initial intention: for example, the development of the language system, the change in the meaning connected with the development of scientific knowledge, changing of scientific, cultural and value paradigm in society, etc.

Thus, the terms giperonim (hyperonyme), giponim (hyponym), fonema (phoneme), etc. correctly oriented for a professional philologist, can be perceived by high school and undergraduate students as non-orienting and semantically obscure (due to differences in the level of education, age-related cognitive abilities, etc.). Or the old term related to word-formation zizhditelnoe imya is perceived by modern philologists as non-orienting (due to differences caused by the development of language, by cultural and historical environment).

As a result of subjective and objective reasons the term that once was oriented, figuratively speaking, say, to the “+” sign and that came with this orientation to the language, for the native speaker may appear to be oriented to the opposite sign

Paraphrasing N.D. Golev (1987: 7), one can make the following conclusion: signs of the phenomena of extra-linguistic world refracted through the linguistic consciousness of the linguistic personality of the addressee are adapted in the lexical-semantic system of language and start functioning in it, obeying not only external, but also internal determinants; and refracting through the addressee’s linguistic consciousness, they may change their characteristics (e.g. orientational state of charge) countless times.

So, the term with the initial subjectively correct orientation functions in the system of this or that science objectively. At the same time, the other native speaker (the addressee) must subjectively "read" the author’s message inherent in the term, using the orientational capabilities of a scientific sign. If there is a conflict between the addressee and the addresser of scientific information (the author of the term and the other subject) in grasping the orientation qualities of the term, then there is also a conflict in the process of cognition itself.

To understand the nature and orientation qualities of the term and to solve inconsistencies caused by subjective and objective reasons in "reading" the term, the concepts of absolute and relative orientation need to be introduced.

Absolute orientation is a subjectively correct orientation, put by the author into the term and recorded in the objective space of language.

Objective space of language (or language objectivity, linguistic objectivity) is language considered without refraction through the consciousness of its speakers; panchrony of the language system: language taken in the unity of the past, present and future.

Subjective space of language (or language subjectivity, linguistic subjectivity) is the subject’s knowledge of the language, language in the perception of the subject - a native speaker.

Absolute orientation is an abstraction, and it is inaccessible for native speakers; only relative orientation is accessible, orientation that is recorded in the subjective space of language.

Thus, terminological orientation is possible in two planes: 1) absolute (author’s, objective), in which all terms are initially correctly oriented; 2) relative ("reader’s", subjective), in which terms are oriented, "readable", transparent, depending on the individual traits of the addressee. We are convinced that analyzing any term, characterizing it from the viewpoint of orienting properties, we have the right to speak only about relative orientation of the term, and only within it, we can distinguish falsely orienting and non-orienting terms: terms with the initially correct orientation which in this synchronous cross section is perceived by this native speaker as false or not perceived at all.

Relative orientation can be studied in two aspects:
1) subjective proper: here one can speak about orientation "for oneself" as for a representative of a certain historical period, social order, social and cultural environment, a person with a certain level of knowledge and education, with a set of individual mental and linguistic distinctive characteristics (characteristics of logical, imaginative thinking, specificity of linguistic personality, etc.). Considering orientation in this aspect, a native speaker answers the question: How am I oriented by this term here and now?

2) subjective-objective: here one can speak about orientation "for the other", taking into account all the above listed factors, but with the restriction that the personality of the other person cannot be perceived in its entirety. Considering orientation in this aspect, a native speaker answers the question: How is the other person ("here and now" or "there and then") oriented by this term?

Let us illustrate this process with examples.

Consider the term fonetika (phonetics), which correctly orients one by the term element –fon-. Students, native Russian speakers, usually memorize easily the Greek translation of the term, and the further use and understanding of the term does not present any problems, because the Russian language has many units with the morpheme -fon- indicating the idea of sounding: telefon (telephone), grammofon (gramophone), magnitofon (tape recorder), fonograf (phonograph), etc.; thus, knowledge of the language system and automatic comparison of these units ensures transparency of the meaning of the words with this morpheme. However, an instructor teaching Russian as a foreign language must ensure that the students really master this term, understand its meaning and orientation - that is, become aware of and grasp the orientation "for the other", because under the conditions described correct orientation -may not occur as easily as it usually does with Russian native speakers. Insufficient knowledge of the language system, inability to become aware of and grasp the relationship between same root words, and on the contrary, erroneous establishing of the relationship between units with different roots – all this is typical of bilinguals and may lead to the situation when the term is not associated with the idea of sounding, when it appears to be non-orienting.

Conclusions

The distinctive feature of terminological nomination is orientation, which is connected with socially oriented character of scientific terminology: the term is created in scientific discourse and functions in scientific, science-educational and science-popular texts, whose addressee and addressee are a linguistic personality of people interested in science and engaged in research activities.

The concepts of motivation (in a broad and narrow sense) and orientation of the term, though having common features, are essentially different, and the use of the unit term orientation for studying terminology seems to be more effective, because it allows us to study the whole range of issues relating to the term: its origin, morphemic composition, structure, relationship of form and meaning, the latter not only linguistically, but also in psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic, linguoculturological, pragmatic and other aspects.

While motivation (in a broad approach) answers the question: which feature underlies nomination, orientation says how it is related to the denoted concept and how this relationship determines realization of an important heuristic function of the term (cognitive, gnoseological), in which it serves as a tool for cognition.

The higher the empathy of a linguistic personality, his/her attention to the individuality of the communication partner, the more successful the subject will be in grasping the orientation "for the other." At the same time, the higher the language and linguistic competence of a native speaker, his/her general erudition, and the greater number of languages s/he knows, the
better his/her orientation "for him-/herself" will be. Orientation "for the other" can contribute to "reading" of the term, to approaching the initial author's orientation of the term, if we take into account all the above-listed parameters in the analysis of the linguistic personality of the creator of the term. Both of these allow approaching absolute orientation.
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